

1 JOSEPH C. FAUCHER (SBN 137353)  
joe.faucher@dbr.com  
2 DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP  
1800 Century Park East  
3 Suite 1400  
Los Angeles, CA 90067-1517  
4 Telephone: (310) 203-4000  
Facsimile: (310) 229-1285  
5

THEODORE M. BECKER (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
6 theodore.becker@dbr.com  
7 JULIE A. GOVREAU (admitted *pro hac vice*)

julie.govreau@dbr.com  
8 DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP  
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 3700  
9 Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: (312) 569-1301  
10 Facsimile: (312) 569-3301

11 Attorneys for Defendant  
GreatBanc Trust Company  
12

13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
14 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
15

16 THOMAS PEREZ, Secretary of the  
United States Department of Labor,

17 Plaintiff,  
18

19 v.

20 GREATBANC TRUST COMPANY, et  
al.,

21 Defendants.  
22

Case No. ED-CV12-1648-R (DTBx)

**RESPONSE BY GREATBANC  
TRUST COMPANY TO  
SECRETARY OF LABOR'S  
OBJECTION TO GREATBANC  
TRUST COMPANY'S GRAPHIC  
AND ILLUSTRATIVE MATERIAL  
AND MOTION IN LIMINE AND  
MOTION TO STRIKE [Doc. #107];  
DECLARATION OF JOSEPH C.  
FAUCHER**

1 The Secretary of Labor seeks exclusion of certain graphic and illustrative  
 2 material that Defendant GreatBanc Trust Company (“GreatBanc”) disclosed as  
 3 required by Local Rule 16-3 on November 22, 2013, 11 days before the original  
 4 trial date. The bases of the Secretary’s objection are that: (1) the proposed graphic  
 5 and illustrative material includes exhibits included within the Confidential  
 6 Supplemental Disclosure, which the Secretary seeks to exclude as an untimely  
 7 “rebuttal” report; (2) the graphic exhibits include “substantially new expert  
 8 analysis” and (3) none of the material in the slides that the Secretary seeks to  
 9 exclude comes “entirely” from the first expert report issued by GreatBanc’s expert  
 10 witness, Richard May, on September 4, 2013. (See, Objection, Doc. 107, pp. 1-2.)  
 11 None of these arguments warrant exclusion of any of the graphic and illustrative  
 12 material disclosed by GreatBanc.

13 First, there is no requirement that expert witnesses be the source of graphic  
 14 and illustrative exhibits. The Secretary’s argument, therefore, that some of the  
 15 proposed graphic and illustrative exhibits are not “entirely” from Mr. May’s  
 16 original expert report, is completely irrelevant to the Court’s inquiry. The  
 17 Secretary’s own arguments work against him in this regard. He states at page 2 of  
 18 the Objection:

19 For example, slide 13 purports to show a comparison of Sierra Aluminum  
 20 Company’s pre and post-transaction equity and debt levels. This slide  
 21 combines numbers from both Sierra’s financial statements and FMV  
 22 Opinions, Inc.’s 2006 appraisal report. As this analysis does not appear in  
 23 Mr. May’s first expert report, it is new analysis that goes beyond the bounds  
 24 of permissible testimony for GreatBanc’s expert.

25 What Plaintiff does not address is why this slide 13 is inadmissible, given  
 26 the fact that the source of the information set forth in the slide is other evidence in  
 27 the case beside GreatBanc’s expert – namely, “Sierra’s financial statements and  
 28 FMV Opinions, Inc.’s 2006 appraisal report.”

1 The material in all of the other slides that the Secretary seeks to exclude is  
 2 also derived from material that is or will be in the record regardless of any expert  
 3 testimony. As a reminder, the Secretary seeks to exclude slides 6-11, 13 and 14.

4 The sources of the information in those slides are as follows:

5 • Slide 6 is derived from information from the June 20, 2006 report of  
 6 FMV Opinions, Inc., an exhibit that the Secretary has offered in this case. The  
 7 information in that slide is not dependent upon testimony of Mr. May.

8 • The information in Slide 7 comes from the expert witness report of  
 9 the Secretary's expert, Dana Messina.

10 • Slide 8 is a quote from the Shannon Pratt treatise on valuation  
 11 regarding the reliability of using book value as a valuation method. It is an exhibit  
 12 to the case, and was cited most recently in the Motion by GreatBanc to exclude  
 13 Mr. Messina's expert witness. It does not depend on expert testimony, and will  
 14 take no one by surprise.

15 • Slide 9 compares median "WACC" rates<sup>1</sup> for guideline public  
 16 companies used in the FMV Opinions, Inc. report, in the expert witness report of  
 17 the guideline public companies mentioned in the Secretary's expert witness report,  
 18 and Sierra. The information could easily be obtained simply from cross-examining  
 19 Mr. Messina at trial.

20 • Slide 10 compares median implied long-term growth rates for  
 21 guideline public companies used in the FMV Opinions, Inc. report, in the expert  
 22 witness report of the guideline public companies mentioned in the Secretary's  
 23 expert witness report, and Sierra. It does not depend upon any original testimony  
 24 of Mr. May.

25 • Slide 11 compares the last 12 months returns on book equity of Sierra  
 26 versus guideline public companies mentioned in the FMV Opinions, Inc. report,

27 \_\_\_\_\_  
 28 <sup>1</sup> "WACC" stands for weighted average cost of capital.

1 and the report of the Secretary's expert Mr. Messina. The source of that  
 2 information is data from the FMV Opinions, Inc. report.

3 • Slide 12 is a synopsis of Mr. May's 3 primary opinions, as set forth in  
 4 his September 4, 2013 expert witness report. The content of that slide comes  
 5 entirely from Mr. May's *original* September 4, 2013 expert witness report. The  
 6 Secretary does not contend that report was untimely.

7 • Slide 14 compares the interest rates on the senior debt issued to Sierra  
 8 with the actual rate on the subordinated "exchange" notes at issue in the subject  
 9 transaction and the estimated market rates for subordinated exchange notes. The  
 10 source of the material on that slide is from the FMV Opinions, Inc. report, and the  
 11 original September 4, 2013 report by Mr. May.

12 Thus, *none* of the slides that the Secretary seeks to exclude are premised on  
 13 expert testimony at all. The slides will be admissible whether or not Mr. May  
 14 testifies about them.

15 Second, the Secretary piggybacks on a motion he filed on November 4, 2013  
 16 (Doc. 63), which sought to exclude GreatBanc's Confidential Supplemental  
 17 Disclosure, which contained certain opinions of GreatBanc's expert witness,  
 18 Richard May.<sup>2</sup> The basis of that Motion was that the Supplemental Disclosure,  
 19 according to the Secretary, constituted an untimely rebuttal expert witness report.  
 20 Although counsel for GreatBanc conferred with the Secretary's counsel on  
 21 October 30 and offered to make Mr. May available for further deposition in  
 22 Washington D.C. (where the Secretary's counsel is located) during the week of  
 23 November 4, counsel for the Secretary refused that offer. (See Declaration of  
 24 Joseph C. Faucher filed November 12, 2013, Doc. 122.) The Secretary's excuses  
 25 for declining this offer were "... that the Court has ordered that discovery in this

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
 27 <sup>2</sup> As of the filing of this Response, the Court has not ruled on this Motion, and no  
 28 hearing has taken place on the motion which has been continued several times  
 based on stipulations of the parties.

1 case is closed pursuant to Dkt. 44, the Secretary's trial preparation should not be  
2 disrupted because GreatBanc forgot about the deadline to submit an expert rebuttal  
3 report, it would be unduly burdensome to prepare and take a second deposition of  
4 Mr. May one month before trial, and Mr. May's second deposition may create  
5 additional discovery issues that we would be foreclosed from pursuing." (See,  
6 Declaration of Joseph C. Faucher filed concurrently herewith, Exh. 1 – October 31,  
7 2013 e-mail from David M. Ellis to Theodore M. Becker and Joseph C. Faucher.)

8       Thereafter, the trial was continued as a result of the Secretary's failure to file  
9 a proper pre-trial conference order, and continued again twice on the Court's own  
10 motion.

11       On December 8, 2013, counsel for GreatBanc reconfirmed that GreatBanc's  
12 offer to make Mr. May available for further deposition relative to the issues raised  
13 in the Supplemental Disclosure remained open. Nine days later, on December 17,  
14 2013, counsel for the Secretary again declined this offer. (See, Declaration of  
15 Joseph C. Faucher filed concurrently herewith, Exhibit 1.) Now, although more  
16 than *six months* have passed since that exchange between counsel for the parties,  
17 the Secretary clings to the fiction that he has somehow been "prejudiced" as a  
18 result of the Confidential Supplemental Disclosure, notwithstanding the fact that  
19 he could have taken Mr. May's further deposition and avoided any claimed  
20 prejudice whatsoever as early as November or December, 2013. Indeed, the  
21 Secretary seeks the further deposition of Mr. May as alternative relief in its  
22 Motion! GreatBanc's offer to present Mr. May for further deposition would  
23 eliminated any possible prejudice to the Secretary, but the Secretary repeatedly  
24 declined that offer.

25       Thus, to the extent the graphic and illustrative material is in any way  
26 derivative of the Confidential Supplemental Disclosure, and the Secretary's  
27 Objection to that graphic and illustrative material is based on his objections to the  
28 Confidential Supplemental Disclosure, the objection should be overruled and the

1 proposed graphic and illustrative material should be allowed. The Secretary has  
2 not established and cannot establish how he has been “prejudiced” in any way. It  
3 was entirely within his counsel’s power to avoid any such purported prejudice, but  
4 counsel made the calculated decision to roll the dice, avoid taking Mr. May’s  
5 further deposition, and hope that the Confidential Supplemental Disclosure would  
6 be excluded.

7 Accordingly, GreatBanc respectfully submits that the Secretary of Labor’s  
8 Objection to the graphic and illustrative material offered by GreatBanc should be  
9 overruled and the motion in limine and motion to strike (which were never noticed  
10 for hearing by the Secretary) should be denied.

11  
12 DATED: May 14, 2014

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP

13  
14 By: /s/ Joseph C. Faucher  
15 JOSEPH C. FAUCHER  
16 Attorneys for Defendant GreatBanc  
17 Trust Company  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28